

Entrapment

Daniel J. Hill, University of Liverpool, djhill@liverpool.ac.uk, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4546-8662>

Stephen K. McLeod (corresponding author), University of Liverpool,
skmcleod@liverpool.ac.uk, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1457-2942>

Attila Tanyi, University of Tromsø – The Arctic University of Norway, attila.tanyi@uit.no,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2027-9446>

Keywords

admissibility of evidence, abuse of process, entrapment, entrapment defence, entrapment remedies, undercover policing

I. Introduction

The word ‘entrapment’ has three common usages in legal discourse. First, it is used in connection with *acts of entrapment*: it applies, at least, to a class of acts in which a party, whom we call the ‘agent’, intentionally brings it about that another party, whom we call the ‘target’, performs a distinct act that is of a criminal type. Secondly, it is used to refer to a *method of proactive law enforcement*: the use of acts of entrapment to secure convictions. Thirdly, it is used, predominantly in the → USA, to refer to *the entrapment defence*: under this usage, it is argued that the offence with which the defendant is charged resulted from an act of entrapment. In most → jurisdictions, and in the literature, the focus has been, as it is here, on acts of entrapment, called ‘legal’, ‘state’, ‘government’ or ‘police’ entrapment, in which the agent is, or is a deputy of, a law-enforcement officer. We mention entrapment by other agents, called ‘civil’, ‘non-state’ or ‘private’ entrapment, only in passing.

An approach to entrapment may be codified in legislation (e.g., as in → South Africa and under Australian federal law) or, more typically, embodied only in case law (e.g., → Canada, → England and Wales, → Germany, Scotland, Singapore, and the US federal jurisdiction). While entrapment is a substantive defence in US federal courts, the criminal courts in other jurisdictions that recognize entrapment respond to it differently. Entrapment can be grounds for mitigation at → sentencing (sometimes, e.g., in Singapore, as the only recognized remedy), for the discretionary exclusion of evidence (e.g., Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, England and Wales, Scotland), or for a permanent stay in proceedings (e.g., Canada, England and Wales, Scotland).

Each of the three usages of ‘entrapment’ may be associated with a corresponding philosophical question. First, there is a definitional question: which acts count as acts of entrapment? Secondly, is entrapment a permissible method of law-enforcement and, if so, in what circumstances? Thirdly, what must criminal courts do to deliver justice, in response to

the finding that an offence was brought about by an act of entrapment? The second and third questions are normative: they cannot be settled just by considering how the courts happen to have responded to claims of entrapment by defendants. Although our three questions are often confused with each other, their distinctness was implied early on, in the US Supreme Court's opinion in *Sorrells v United States* ([1932] 441):

the evidence was sufficient to warrant a finding that the act for which defendant was prosecuted was instigated by the prohibition agent, that it was the creature of his purpose, that defendant had no previous disposition to commit it [...] and that the agent lured defendant, otherwise innocent, to its commission by repeated and persistent solicitation [...]. Such a gross abuse of authority given for the purpose of detecting and punishing crime, and not for the making of criminals, deserves the severest condemnation; but the question whether it precludes prosecution or affords a ground of defense, and, if so, upon what theory, has given rise to conflicting opinions.

Hughes CJ here begins by characterizing the agent's act of entrapment. He then asserts that, while the agent's act was an abuse of authority, this does not prejudice the question of the target's criminal liability. These assertions presuppose the distinctness of the questions of permissibility and of what the appropriate response should be when a defendant has been entrapped.

We now consider how the law and scholars have answered our three questions.

II. What is Entrapment?

What conditions must an act meet in order for it to be an act of entrapment? While it is possible that there is no good answer to that question, this would perhaps have unfortunate

consequences for the law, and it is not a conclusion hastily to be embraced. At present, the question is more often addressed in passing than in detail. Case law and the literature exhibit a multitude of conflicting views on it. Moreover, there has been a propensity, especially in the USA, inadequately to distinguish it from the question whether the → defendant can reasonably be held culpable. The tendency to define entrapment in ways that already incorporate considerations of permissibility, impermissibility, → culpability, or the lack thereof arguably fosters confusion. As *Sorrells* allows, the question of what entrapment *is* admits of treatment as distinct from questions about permissibility and culpability; answering it before attempting to answer any normative questions seems to be apt methodology.

While US legal thought on entrapment was forged in the state courts in the late nineteenth century, federal cases predominate from *Sorrells* onwards. Associate Justice Roberts defined entrapment as:

the conception and planning of an offense by an officer, and his procurement of its commission by one who would not have perpetrated it except for the trickery, persuasion, or fraud of the officer.

Sorrells v United States ([1932] 454, Roberts J, concurring)

This definition includes some elements that commonly feature in later definitions. These include the following conditions (stated in our terms): (i) the entrapping agent is a law-enforcement agent; (ii) the agent intends that the target perform an act (of the agent's devising) that is a criminal offence; (iii) the agent procures that act via 'trickery, persuasion or fraud'; (iv) the target would not have performed the act if the agent had not procured it.

While *Sorrells* did involve such deception, condition (iii) allows for, but does not require, that the agent deceives the target. Subsequently, however, the US Supreme Court and

scholars have often included a deception condition. Likewise, the definition allows for, but does not require, that the agent tempts, or tries to tempt, the target. Considerations of temptation feature in the Court's subsequent cases, but these fall short of amounting to the introduction of a temptation condition; scholars, however, have often included one.

In relation to condition (iii), we may distinguish between entrapment (which necessarily involves procurement) and the mere presentation of an opportunity: this distinction, or one close to it, is subsequently made by the Court, e.g., in *Jacobson v United States* ([1992] 549–50), and in many other → jurisdictions (see Section IV).

Condition (iv) is a counterfactual condition. Since procuring an action is a way of bringing it about, (iii) seems to render (iv) at least partly redundant. Dispensing with (iv) may also be desirable, given that it rests upon a contentious, counterfactual, philosophy of causation.

A controversy about predisposition has exercised the US Supreme Court since *Sorrells*. It relates to the dispute, played out in the Court, between 'subjectivist' and 'objectivist' approaches to entrapment. Subjectivism focuses upon the target's predisposition. According to the Court in *Sorrells*:

the defense of entrapment is not simply that the particular act was committed at the instance of government officials. [...] The predisposition and criminal design of the → defendant are relevant. But the issues raised and the evidence (→ Evidence and Proof (General Principles)) adduced must be pertinent to *the controlling question whether the defendant is a person otherwise innocent whom the government is seeking to punish for an alleged offense which is the product of the creative activity of its own officials*. If that is the fact, common justice requires that the accused be permitted to prove it. The government in such a case is in no position to object to evidence of the

activities of its representatives in relation to the accused, and, if the defendant seeks acquittal by reason of entrapment, he cannot complain of an appropriate and searching inquiry into his own conduct and predisposition as bearing upon that issue.

Sorrells v United States ([1932] 451, our italics)

Objectivism focuses upon the agent's conduct, as in this early statement of it:

[...] courts must be closed to the trial of a crime instigated by the government's own agents. No other issue, no comparison of equities as between the guilty official and the guilty defendant, has any place in the enforcement of this overruling principle of public policy.

Sorrells v United States ([1932] 459, Roberts J, concurring)

The debate, particularly prominent at the US Supreme Court, about the relevance of predisposition is better conceived of not as concerning whether the absence of predisposition is necessary to entrapment's having occurred, but rather as about the conditions for the applicability of the entrapment → defence (or alternatives to it applicable in the jurisdiction).

Stitt and James ([1984] 114) write:

Neither the subjective nor the objective test is a test of whether entrapment *in fact* took place. [...] The subjective and objective tests are criteria for determining whether people are to be held accountable for the crimes that they were entrapped into committing.

Accordingly, and as the divergent approaches of the criminal courts in different jurisdictions to entrapment scenarios might suggest, there is a core concept of entrapment that is neutral about the appropriate response of the courts to entrapment scenarios. Conditions (i)–(iv) above can be seen as seeking to explicate such a concept. Plausibly, conceptual clarity favours defining entrapment in a manner consistent with both subjectivist and objectivist approaches to its implications for the criminal process (if this can be done).

III. Entrapment and Law Enforcement

Although some judges and commentators reserve the term ‘entrapment’ for what they regard as illegitimate acts, we assume a neutral usage that keeps open the question about entrapment’s permissibility. At its most stringent, objectivism maintains that entrapment is impermissible, no matter the target. Objectivist judges at the US Supreme Court have opposed entrapment on such grounds as the following.

- Entrapment is inconsistent with the duty of law-enforcement agents to prevent, rather than to create, crime. (*Sherman v United States* [1958] 384, Frankfurter J, concurring; *United States v Russell* [1973] 445, 449, Stewart J, dissenting) Subjectivists sometimes support a weaker version of this objection, that restricts it to when the target is not predisposed. (*Sorrells v United States* [1932] 441)
- Furthermore, it fails genuinely to detect crime. (*Sherman v United States* [1958] 384, Frankfurter J, concurring)
- It is inimical to ‘the purity’ or ‘integrity’ of ‘government and its processes’. (*Sorrells v United States* [1932] 455, cf. 457, Roberts J, concurring; *United States v Russell* [1973] 445, Stewart J, dissenting)

- It might undermine public confidence in the criminal-justice system and, thereby, the rule of law. (*Sherman v United States* [1958] 380, Frankfurter J, concurring)

In academic work, these objections have been mirrored in the objections that entrapment (at least without, and often despite, reasonable suspicion): creates crime and thereby results in ‘incoherence’ or ‘inconsistency’ in the system of criminal justice (Dworkin [1985] 32–34; Ashworth [2002] 127); fails to accomplish genuine detection (Dworkin [1985] 33); breaches the ‘integrity’ of the system (Ashworth [2002] 126–128, Leverick and Stark [2010] 472); and is inimical to democratic values (Stitt and James [1984] 125–130). Among numerous further objections from scholars are that entrapment appears inconsistent with the → presumption of innocence (Körner [2002] 451), that it is oppressive to the defendant (Leverick and Stark [2010] 469, 472), that it is an abuse of process (Leverick and Stark [2010] 468, 469, 472), that it objectionably subverts the target’s autonomy (Hughes [2004] 45, 53–57), that it is readily open to abuses such as the victimization of personal or political enemies, the silencing of opponents and blackmail (Marx [1982] 166, 175, 183, Stitt and James [1984] 116, 125–128), and that, by reason of the ‘dirty hands’ involved in entrapment, the state lacks the standing to condemn the target (Ho [2011] 78, 88–91, 95). An objection that features, at least in the background, in the thinking of many of entrapment’s strong opponents, is that entrapment involves treating the target as a mere means towards their own conviction (Leverick and Stark [2010] 469).

Judges at the US Supreme Court that have seen entrapment as permissible in some circumstances have argued that resort to it facilitates the detection of some crimes otherwise impossible or difficult to detect, and that due process (→ Due Process and Fair Trial) does not always debar it (e.g., *Hampton v United States* [1976] 495, Fn. 7, Powell J, concurring). Pragmatic considerations about detection, however, neither settle normative questions of

justice and ethics nor establish that detecting crime is a dominant end that other ends or values (including those to which objectivists commonly appeal) must subserve.

Entrapment's most stringent critics, such as those mentioned near the beginning of this section, have stated relatively clearly both their view that entrapment is impermissible, no matter the status or predisposition of the target, and their reasons for holding that view. By contrast, the reasons behind the contrary view that entrapment is permissible when the target is predisposed, or reasonably suspected of being a habitual criminal, await comparable articulation and defence. The view that entrapping the predisposed can be a just practice, while entrapping a person that lacks predisposition is generally unjust, seems more often to have been treated as obvious than rationally defended. Subjectivists that adopt it are faced with the problem of why the stated injustice of entrapping someone lacking predisposition is not also held to apply to like cases of private entrapment.

IV. Entrapment and Criminal Justice

The question whether entrapment 'precludes prosecution or affords a ground of defense, and, if so, upon what theory' (*Sorrells v United States* [1932] 441) remains pertinent, as does the broader question of how the courts should respond to entrapment scenarios. The disparate ways in which different jurisdictions treat entrapment, the dispute between subjectivists and objectivists (which remains unresolved from a philosophical point of view), recent controversies in → Germany, and the absence of well-articulated entrapment doctrines in many jurisdictions (e.g., → India and the Republic of → Ireland) show these to be live questions.

1. → Australia

The courts have repeatedly rejected the idea of a substantive entrapment defence. Before *Ridgeway v The Queen* [1995] many of the state courts in Australia inclined as a response to entrapment towards a permanent stay of proceedings on the basis of an abuse of process, and those in other states towards discretionary exclusion of evidence. In *Ridgeway*, the High Court of Australia rejected the arguments for a permanent stay, pointing out instead that the Australian courts already had the discretion to exclude evidence (→ Evidence (Types of)) that had been obtained, in an illegal or otherwise improper manner, via procurement of an offence (or an element of it), and that if the exclusion of this evidence would remove all reasonable prospect of a conviction, then the court could stay proceedings on that ground. The High Court reached this position for reasons of public policy concerning the integrity of the courts, observance of the law by law-enforcement agents, and the propriety of the conduct of those agents, not principally for considerations about citizens' rights, or in connection with any specific unfairness to the → accused. In response to *Ridgeway*, the federal government and the states of New South Wales, Queensland and South Australia legislated to allow law-enforcement agents or their deputies to engage in illegal activity as part of controlled activities or operations, deeming evidence obtained thereby as not necessarily inadmissible: the court's discretion to exclude evidence is to be exercised only when the court considers the agent's conduct to be so grave as to require a remedy that outweighs the public interest in conviction.

2. → Canada

In *Kirzner v The Queen* [1978], entrapment was characterized as involving 'the use of *agents provocateurs* who go beyond mere solicitation or encouragement and initiate a criminal design for the purpose of entrapping a person in order to prosecute him' (494). In *Amato v The Queen* [1982], the Court settled on the view that a stay of proceedings was the

appropriate response to entrapment and it deemed mitigation at sentencing unsatisfactory. *R v Mack* [1988] 965 clarifies that, while reasonable suspicion is required if the agent's presentation of an opportunity to perform a criminal act is to be justifiable, neither reasonable suspicion nor the target's predisposition can justify the agent in going beyond the mere presentation of an opportunity. In fact, the Court holds that entrapment occurs whenever:

(a) the authorities provide a person with an opportunity to commit an offence without acting on a reasonable suspicion that this person is already engaged in criminal activity or pursuant to a *bona fide* inquiry;

(b) although having such a reasonable suspicion or acting in the course of a *bona fide* inquiry, they go beyond providing an opportunity and induce the commission of an offence.

(*R v Mack* [1988] 964 [134]–[135])

R v Barnes [1991] 460–461 [22]–[23], citing *R v Mack* [1988] 956, holds that *bona fide* inquiry may include the presentation of an opportunity to an individual about whom, specifically, there is no reasonable suspicion, provided that the individual is present in an area where there is known to be regular relevant criminal activity, such as drug dealing.

3. → England and Wales

In *R v Sang* [1980], Lord Diplock, in giving the leading judgment, asserted that:

It is no part of a judge's function to exercise disciplinary powers over the police or prosecution as respects the way in which evidence to be used at the trial is obtained by

them. [...] However much the judge may dislike the way in which a particular piece of evidence was obtained before proceedings were commenced, if it is admissible evidence probative of the accused's guilt it is no part of his judicial function to exclude it for this reason. [...] Save with regard to admissions and confessions and generally with regard to evidence obtained from the accused after commission of the offence, he has no discretion to refuse to admit relevant admissible evidence on the ground that it was obtained by improper or unfair means. The court is not concerned with how it was obtained. It is no ground for the exercise of discretion to exclude that the evidence was obtained as the result of the activities of an agent provocateur. (*R v Sang* [1980] 436–437)

The law was changed by the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, s 78, under which evidence may be excluded at trial if it is deemed by the court to have been obtained unfairly. In *R v Looseley* [2001], Lord Nicholls expressed strong antipathy to entrapment and stated that:

English law has now developed remedies in respect of entrapment: the court may stay the relevant criminal proceedings, and the court may exclude evidence pursuant to section 78. [...] [A]s a matter of principle a stay of the proceedings, or of the relevant charges, is the more appropriate form of remedy. A prosecution founded on entrapment would be an abuse of the court's process. (*R v Looseley* [2001] [16])

[...] the existence or absence of predisposition in the individual is not the criterion by which the acceptability of police conduct is to be decided. Predisposition does not

make acceptable what would otherwise be unacceptable conduct on the part of the police or other law enforcement agencies. (*R v Looseley* [2001] [22])

Thus, Lord Hoffmann added at *R v Looseley* [2001] [68], ‘predisposition is irrelevant to whether a stay should be granted’.

4. → European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)

The ECtHR sees entrapment as breaching Article 6.1 of the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR), which protects the right to a fair trial and includes the → presumption of innocence. The right to a fair trial (→ Due Process and Fair Trial) is construed as pertinent not just to the trial itself, but to the criminal process, including the → investigation.

In *Lüdi v Switzerland* [1992], the ECtHR upheld the use of an ‘undercover agent [to investigate] criminal activity in a predominantly passive manner without using his own influence to arouse willingness to commit the act and induce criminal conduct’ (*Lüdi v Switzerland* [1992] 178, para 21). In *Teixeira De Castro v Portugal* [1998], the Court found against Portugal because the police ‘instigated the offence and there is nothing to suggest that without their intervention it would have been committed’ (*Teixeira De Castro v Portugal* [1998] 116, para 39). *Furcht v Germany* [2014], which consolidated the approach displayed in *Teixeira*, represents the current approach of the ECtHR to entrapment. In *Furcht*, the ECtHR did not regard mitigation at sentencing as providing sufficient redress and, while advocating no specific response from the range of alternatives in its place, it held that ‘for the trial to be fair [...] all evidence obtained as a result of police incitement must be excluded or a procedure with similar consequences must apply’ (*Furcht v Germany* [2014] 717–8, para 64).

The Court viewed the following factors as indicative of incitement: the agent's conduct went beyond the 'passive' investigation of criminal activity (*Furcht v Germany* [2014] 714, para 48); there was no reasonable suspicion that the target was already in the habit of like criminal activity when first approached (*Furcht v Germany* [2014] 714, para 50); the target initially refused to act as the agent suggested, but the agent tried again and succeeded (*Furcht v Germany* [2014] 715, para 52). If a defendant can reasonably submit that they were incited by a relevant agent, then the onus is on the → prosecution to show that entrapment did not happen, though '[i]n practice, the authorities may be prevented from discharging this burden by the absence of formal authorisation and supervision of the undercover operation' (*Furcht v Germany* [2014] 715, para 53; → Undercover Investigation). In *R v Syed* [2018], the Court of Appeal of England and Wales stated that the concession in *Furcht* to what may be the case 'in practice' 'appears to suggest that if the state fails to discharge the burden of proof, the failure may not be fatal' (*R v Syed* [2018] 2484G [112]).

5. Federal Republic of → Germany

German law distinguishes between admissible and inadmissible 'Tatprovokation' by law-enforcement agents or their deputies (e.g., BGH 1 StR 221/99 para 12, and BGH 4 StR 252/15).

From 1984 until 2014, when the ECtHR ruled it insufficient in *Furcht v Germany* [2014], mitigation at → sentencing was normally deemed the appropriate response both to unacceptable and to acceptable entrapment, and the former would, other things being equal, have greater mitigatory force. The ECtHR's ruling has intensified the long-running controversy in Germany about the appropriate response to entrapment. The Second Criminal Panel of the BGH followed the ECtHR in deeming the exclusion of evidence an unsatisfactory response to unacceptable entrapment (BGH 2 StR 97/14, paras 41–43). While

the Second Panel instead favoured a permanent stay of proceedings, divergent responses to the ECtHR ruling in Germany have led to calls for a legislative solution.

6. → Hong Kong

Before *R v Looseley* [2001], the courts took the view that entrapment could diminish responsibility. They favoured mitigation at sentencing when it was deemed to have done so (*Hong Kong Special Administrative Region v Daswani* [1997]). Since *Looseley*, this has co-existed with the view that, when it involves police conduct that seriously affronts ‘the public conscience’, entrapment can justify a permanent stay on the basis of abuse of process (*Hong Kong Special Administrative Region v Wong Kwok Hung* [2007] 467–8).

7. → India

The most notable entrapment cases have involved media entrapment. While there has been relatively little discussion of entrapment by law-enforcement agents, it has been deemed impermissible in some majority judgments, and strong judicial disapproval of it dates back at least to the 1950s. In *Ramjanam Singh v State Of Bihar* [1956] the Supreme Court of India stated:

Whatever the criminal tendencies of a man may be, he has a right to expect that he will not be deliberately tempted beyond the powers of his frail endurance and provoked into breaking the law; and more particularly by those who are the guardians and keepers of the law. However regrettable the necessity of employing agents provocateurs [*sic*] may be [...], it is one thing to tempt a suspected offender to overt action when he is doing all he can to commit a crime and has every intention of carrying through his nefarious purpose from start to finish, and quite another to egg him on to do that which it has

been finally and firmly decided shall not be done. (*Ramjanam Singh v State Of Bihar* [1956] per Bose J, at para 37)

The courts have traditionally held that relevant evidence, however attained, is admissible provided that the manner of its attainment is consistent with statutes. The Supreme Court of India said in *Umesh Kumar v State of Andhra Pradesh* [2013] para 37:

It is a settled legal proposition that even if a document is procured by improper or illegal means, there is no bar to its admissibility if it is relevant and its genuineness is proved. If the evidence is admissible, it does not matter how it has been obtained. However, as a matter of caution, the court in exercise of its discretion may disallow certain evidence in a criminal case if the strict rules of admissibility would operate unfairly against the accused.

Other entrapment remedies have not found favour and the courts have not settled upon an approach.

8. Malaysia

In *Wan Mohd Azman bin Hassan @ Wan Ali v PP* [2010], Abdull Hamid Embong FCJ (for the court) took the following positions:

- (i) There is no entrapment defence (whether substantive or otherwise) in Malaysia.
- (ii) The use of *agents provocateurs* is sanctioned by the Dangerous Drugs Act 1952 s 40A. Evidence obtained thereby is admissible.
- (iii) An *agent provocateur* is not an accomplice, for (quoting *Emperor v Chaturbhuj Sahu* [1911] 105 (Doss J) and citing *Teja Singh & Mohamed Nasir v Public*

Prosecutor [1950] and *Goh Lai Wak v Public Prosecutor* [1994]) while an accomplice ‘extends no aid to the prosecution’ until *after* the commission of the offence an *agent provocateur* is an agent for the prosecution from the outset.

- (iv) That evidence was obtained in an unfair or improper manner is insufficient, under s 40A of the Dangerous Drugs Act 1952, for it to be inadmissible.
- (v) Malaysian law allows for neither a permanent stay nor for discretionary exclusion of evidence.
- (vi) These observations notwithstanding, whether a defendant was entrapped is a question of fact. For the fact to be established, however, the defendant would need to have been an ‘unwary innocent’.

9. → New Zealand

The courts distinguish between merely presenting an opportunity to commit an offence and encouraging or stimulating someone that did not already intend to commit it to do so. In the latter scenario, the court has the discretion to exclude evidence on grounds of public policy relating to abuse of process. This approach has been well-established in case law since *R v O'Shanessy* [1973], and is partly embodied in the Evidence Act 2006. The courts also have a general power to stay proceedings to prevent an abuse of process: *Moeyao v Department of Labour* [1980].

10. Northern Ireland

The principles enunciated in *Looseley* hold in Northern Ireland also: *R v Bellingham* [2003] and *R v Kearns* [2010].

11. Republic of Ireland

In *DPP v Bowe and Casey* [2017] para 55, the court described entrapment as ‘a recognised basis of defence in Irish law’. Nevertheless, → Ireland has not established a well-developed approach to entrapment. In practice, however, the courts (→ Courts and Tribunals) observe the view of the ECtHR that entrapment compromises the right of the accused to a fair trial (under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights). Relatedly, in their dealings with *Director of Public Prosecution v Mills* [2015] and *Mills v Ireland* [2017], the Court of Appeal and the ECtHR have criticized the absence of an adequate legislative or regulatory framework governing undercover policing in Ireland.

12. Republic of → South Africa

South Africa’s approach is embodied in the Criminal Procedure Act 1977, s 252A, amended by the Criminal Procedure Second Amendment Act 1996. Law-enforcement agents or their deputies may present a target with an opportunity to offend and, provided that their influence upon an offence does not go beyond having offered it as an opportunity, the evidence thereby gained is admissible (s 252A(1)). Otherwise, the discretion to exclude evidence applies (s 252(A)(3)(a)). The Act provides a long list of criteria for determining whether the agents went beyond merely offering an opportunity (s 252A(2)), and it affords a high degree of judicial discretion. The Act also instructs the court to weigh the public interest against the interests of the accused (s 252A(3)(b)). When the accused reasonably contends that the agents did more than merely offer an opportunity, the burden of proof is placed on the prosecution to demonstrate the admissibility of the evidence (s 252A(6)).

13. Scotland

In the 2000s, Scotland moved from a position that had favoured the discretionary exclusion of evidence as a remedy for entrapment to one that favoured a permanent stay. There has

been debate about whether the rationale for stay lies in abuse of process (*Brown v HM Advocate* [2002]) or in the ‘oppression’ of the defendant (*Jones v HM Advocate* [2009]).

14. → Singapore

The Court of Appeal has repeatedly (*How Poh Sun v PP* [1991] 219 and subsequent cases) rejected the idea of an entrapment defence, holding (following *R v Sang* [1980]) that it is the business of the criminal courts to deal only with the evidence presented, rather than with the propriety with which it was gathered. According to the Court, ‘If entrapment can be considered at all, it is relevant only insofar as mitigation of the sentence is concerned’ (*PP v Rozman bin Jusoh* [1995] 329). Moreover, ‘the invocation of the court process *for the bona fide prosecution of criminals* [...] is not an abuse of process, even though the evidence against the accused may have been obtained by state entrapment’, so ‘*Looseley* has no application in Singapore’ (*Law Society of Singapore v Tan Guat Neo Phyllis* [2007] paras 138–139).

15. → USA

The US federal courts are notable for their long-standing recognition of, and sustained debates about, a substantive entrapment defence: this is reflected in the large amount of scholarship on entrapment that focuses on the US federal jurisdiction. Under the subjectivism that has prevailed at the US Supreme Court, the entrapment defence rests on two core elements: (i) that the target’s act was instigated by (or on behalf of) a law-enforcement agent; (ii) that the target was not predisposed. Although subjectivism has prevailed since *Sorrells v United States* [1932], some strong statements of objectivism have been offered from *Sorrells* through to *Hampton v United States* [1976].

Mathews v United States [1988] engages in the debate over whether the entrapment defence requires that the defendant should admit all elements of the offence, in particular criminal intent, with the majority concluding that it does not, and (like *Jacobson v United States* [1992]) discusses how the notion of predisposition should be understood, particularly in relation to the point at which the agent first contacts the target.

Marcus [2016] is a comprehensive study of US entrapment law. It includes coverage of cases at lower federal and state levels, as well as statutes at state level. Chapter 5 shows that in a significant minority of states, objectivist approaches to entrapment modelled on the approach in the Model Penal Code, or in one of the proposed revisions to the Federal Criminal Code, are adopted (sometimes by statute) and that some states adopt a hybrid approach.

V. Conclusion

Although the debate between subjectivist and objectivist judges in the US Supreme Court has been dominant in many discussions of how entrapment should be defined, it is actually the appropriate response to entrapment that it puts at the forefront, and participants on both sides tend to confuse this normative question with the definitional question.

There is a consensus among legal authorities, recognized also by many scholars, that there is a distinction, of significant legal bearing, between merely presenting a target with an opportunity to offend and encouraging the target to do so. This consensus might help foster optimism about the prospects for a definition of entrapment that is neutral concerning the appropriate administration of justice.

The legal bearing of the aforementioned distinction amounts, in some jurisdictions, to the seeing of the mere provision of an opportunity as a permissible aspect of proactive law

enforcement, with measures that go beyond the mere presentation of an opportunity, and that seek to persuade, solicit or incite, being seen as harder to justify, or even as impermissible.

Most jurisdictions outside the USA that have contemplated having a substantive entrapment defence have emphatically rejected it as unsound, thereby managing to avoid many of the controversies that have arisen at the US Supreme Court. They have also avoided an acute form of the ‘problem’ of private entrapment that faces US subjectivists. Entrapment by an agent of the state cannot nullify guilt unless entrapment by a private individual can also do so. The view that entrapment by a private individual can nullify guilt is both uncommon and unconvincing. If there is something that is generally wrong with prosecuting an entrapped defendant, it would not seem to be that the defendant is, because they were entrapped by an agent of the state, actually innocent.

Despite the disparate approaches to entrapment across the jurisdictions here surveyed, all but Malaysia recognize that entrapment at least sometimes requires redress, and only Singapore clings to mitigation at sentencing as sole remedy. Nations belonging to the Council of Europe must reckon with the ECtHR’s ruling that entrapment jeopardizes the human right to a fair trial. This point of view, alongside the Court’s rejection of the adequacy of mitigation at sentencing as a remedy, might come to have wider global influence.

When considering how the courts in each of the jurisdictions here surveyed have switched from favouring one sort of principal entrapment remedy to another, some interesting patterns emerge. The move is always away from mitigation at sentencing as sole remedy, never towards it. The same goes, in general, for discretionary exclusion of evidence. Among jurisdictions that have favoured a permanent stay, by contrast, only Australian federal law has relinquished it in favour of another remedy. If we suppose that systems of criminal justice tend towards moral progress over time, or that the attainment of justice is something towards which convergence of opinion might tend, then these patterns give succour to the view

(supported by such scholars as Ashworth and Ho) that, among the remedies surveyed here, permanent stay is the most appropriate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Case Law:

Australia

Ridgeway v The Queen [1995] HCA 66, (1995) 184 CLR 19, (1995) 129 ALR 41 (Federal)

Canada

Amato v The Queen 1982 CanLII 31 (SCC), [1982] 2 SCR 418, 1982 CarswellBC 661, 1982 JE 820 (Federal)

Kirzner v The Queen 1977 CanLII 38 (SCC), [1978] 2 SCR 487, 1977 CarswellOnt 1, [1977] SCJ No. 123 (Federal)

R v Barnes 1991 CanLII 84 (SCC), [1991] 1 SCR 449, 1991 CarswellBC 11 (Federal)

R v Mack 1988 CanLII 24 (SCC), [1988] 2 SCR 903, 1988 CarswellBC 701 (Federal)

England and Wales

Nottingham City Council v Amin [2000] 1 WLR 1071, [2000] 1 Cr App R (S) 426.

R v Ameer and Lucas [1977] Criminal LR 174

R v Chalkley and Jeffries [1997] EWCA Crim 3416, (1998) 2 Cr App R 79

R v Horseferry Road Magistrates Court, ex parte Bennett (No. 1) [1993] UKHL 10, [1994] 1 AC 42

R v Latif [1996] UKHL 16, [1996] 1 WLR 10

R v Looseley [2001] UKHL 53, [2001] 1 WLR 2060R v Sang [1979] UKHL 3, [1980] AC
402

R v Smurthwaite and Gill (1994) 98 Cr App R 437

R v Syed (Haroon) [2018] EWCA Crim 2809, [2019] 1 WLR 2459, (2019) Crim L R 442

European Court of Human Rights

Bannikova v Russia [2010] ECHR 1730, App No. 18757/06 (4 November 2010)

Edwards and Lewis v United Kingdom [2003] ECHR 381, (2005) 40 EHRR 24, App Nos
39647/98 and 40461/98 (22 July 2003)

Furcht v Germany [2014] ECHR 1138, (2015) 61 EHRR 25, App No. 54648/09 (23 October
2014)

Lüdi v Switzerland [1992] ECHR 50, (1993) 15 EHRR 173, App No. 12433/86 (15 June
1992)

Mills v Ireland [2017] ECHR 984, (2018) 66 EHRR SE3, App No. 50468/16 (10 October
2017)

Ramanauskas v. Lithuania (no. 2) [2018] ECHR 181, App. No. 55146/14 (20 February 2018)

Tchokhanelidze v Georgia [2018] ECHR 553, App No. 31536/07 (28 June 2018)

Teixeira De Castro v Portugal [1998] ECHR 52, (1999) 28 EHRR 101, App No. 25829/94 (9
June 1998)

Federal Republic of Germany

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice], 1 StR 148/84, 23 May 1984 (LG
Stuttgart), 1984 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift [NJW] 2300, 2302

Bundesgerichtshofs [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice], 1 StR 685/94, 7 March 1995 (LG
Traunstein), 1995 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift [NJW] 2237, 2238

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice], 1 StR 221/99, 18 November 1999

(LG München) reported in Entscheidungen des Bundesgerichtshofs in Strafsachen
[BGHSt] 45, 321

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice], 2 StR 97/14, 10 June 2015 (LG Bonn)
reported in 36 Strafverteidiger [STV] 129 (2016)

Bundesgerichtshof [BGH] [Federal Court of Justice] 4 StR 252/15, 19 January 2016 (LG
Zweibrücken) reported in 2016 Neue Zeitschrift für Strafrecht [NSTZ]

232 Bundesverfassungsgericht [BVerfGE] [Federal Constitutional Court], 2 BvR
209/14, 18 December 2014, 2015 Neue Juristische Wochenschrift [NJW] 1083

Hong Kong

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region v Chan Wan Cheung & Anor [2007] HKCA 393,
[2007] 4 HKLRD 606, 2007 WL 2383143 (CA), [2007] HKEC 1641 (Court of
Appeal)

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region v Cheung Yun Kei [2001] HKCA 103, [2001] 4
HKC 52, 2001 WL 718647 (CA), [2001] HKEC 735 (Court of Appeal)

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region v Daswani Anil Shewakram [1997] HKCA 137,
1997 WL 33125417 (CA), [1997] HKLY 369 (Court of Appeal)

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region v Kwang Cheuk Wai [otherwise 'Kwang Cheuk
Nai'] [2004] 2 HKC 225 (District Court)

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region v Wong Kwok Hung [2007] HKCA 17, [2007] 2
HKLRD 621, 2007 WL 2601 (CA), [2007] HKEC 111, [2007] 1 HKC 462 (Court of
Appeal)

The Queen v Liu Chun Fai [1987] HKCA 165, 1987 WL 717088 (CA), [1987] HKLR
1032 (Court of Appeal)

The Secretary of State for Justice v Solomon Dominic Musa [2000] HKCA 7, [2001] 1 HKC 14, 2000 WL 33315555 (CA), [2001] HKEC 9 (Court of Appeal)

India

Anand v Registrar of the Delhi High Court [2009] INSC 1323, (2009) 8 SCC 106 (Supreme Court of India, 29 July 2009)

Court on Its Own Motion v State [2008] INDLHC 2348, CRLW 796/2007 (Delhi High Court, 21 August 2008)

Emperor v Chaturbhuj Sahu (1911) ILR 38 CAL 96 (Calcutta High Court, 8 September 1910)

Pushpadevi M. Jatia v Wadhawan [also Wadhawan] [1987] INSC 144, AIR 1987 SC 1748, 1987 (3) SCR 46, 1987 (3) SCC 367 (Supreme Court of India, 29 April 1987)

Rajat Prasad v CBI (2014) [2014] INSC 355, 6 SCC 495 (Supreme Court of India, 24 April 2014)

Ramjanam Singh v State of Bihar AIR 1956 SC 643, 1956 CriLJ 1254 (Supreme Court of India, 2 November 1954)

Umesh Kumar v State of Andhra Pradesh [2013] INSC 833, (2013) 10 SCC 591 (Supreme Court of India, 6 September 2013)

Yusufalli Esmail Nagree v State of Maharashtra [1967] INSC 114, AIR 1968 SC 147, 1967 SCR (3) 720 (Supreme Court of India, 19 April 1967)

Malaysia

Public Prosecutor v Han Kong Juan [1983] CLJ Rep 773, [1983] CLJ (Rep) 773 (High Court, 24 September 1982)

Suzimi bin Shaari v PP [2011] MYCA 47, [2011] 5 MLJ 164 (Court of Appeal, 15 March 2011)

Teja Singh and Mohamed Nasir v PP [1950] MLJ 71 (Johore, 28 January 1950)

Wan Mohd Azman bin Hassan @ Wan Ali v PP [2010] MLJU 271, [2010] 4 MLJ 141

(Federal Court, Putrajaya, 25 March 2010)

New Zealand

Moevao v Department of Labour [1980] 1 NZLR 464 CA

Police v Lavalle [1979] 1 NZLR 45

R v Capner [1974] NZHC 152, [1975] 1 NZLR 411

R v Liu [2009] NZCA 409, [2009] BCL 795, BC200963915

R v Loughlin [1982] NZCA 1, [1982] 1 NZLR 236

R v O'Shanessy (1973) 2 CRNZ 1

R v Pethig [1977] 1 NZLR 448

Northern Ireland

R v Bellingham [2003] NICC 2

R v Hill [2020] NICA 30, [2020] 5 WLUK 529

R v Kearns [2010] NICC 32

R v McCaugherty [2011] NICA 45

R v McKeown [2004] NICA 41, [2005] NI 301, [2004] 10 WLUK 794

Republic of Ireland

Dental Board v O'Callaghan [1969] IR 181

DPP v Bowe and Casey [2017] IECA 250

DPP v Casey [2019] IESC 7

DPP v JC [2015] IESC 31, [2017] 1 IR 417

DPP v Mills [2015] IECA 305, [2015] 4 IR 659

DPP v Mills [2016] IESCDET 45

DPP v Van Onzen and Loopmans 1996 WJSC-CCA 911, [1996] 2 ILRM 387

McElvaney v The Standards in Public Office Commission [2019] IEHC 633

Syon v Hewitt and McTiernan [2006] IEHC 376, [2008] 1 IR 168

Republic of South Africa

S v Dube 2000 (2) SA 583

S v Hammond [2007] ZASCA 164, [2007] SCA 164 (RSA), [2008] 2 All SA 226 (SCA),
2008 (1) SACR 476 (SCA)

S v Hassen 1997 (2) SA 253

S v Malinga 1963 (1) SA 692

S v Mkonto 2001 (1) SACR 585, 2001 (4) BCLR 401

S v Nkadimeng 1962 (4) SA 564

S v Nkosiyana 1966 (4) SA 655

S v Nortjé 1997 (1) SA 90

S v Reeding [2005] ZAWCHC 13, 2005 (2) SACR 631

Scotland

Brown v HM Advocate [2002] ScotHC 65, 2002 SLT 809

Cook v Skinner, MacDonald v Skinner 1977 JC 9

Jones v HM Advocate [2009] ScotHC HCJAC 86, 2010 JC 255

Marsh v Johnston [1959] Crim L R 444

Weir v Jessop (No.2) [1991] ScotHC HCJAC 1, 1991 JC 146

Singapore

Chi Tin Hui v PP [1994] 1 SLR 778

Goh Lai Wak v PP [1994] 1 SLR 748

How Poh Sun v PP [1991] SGCA 22, [1991] 3 MLJ 216

Lai Kam Loy v PP [1993] SGHC 181, [1994] 1 SLR 787

Law Society of Singapore v Tan Guat Neo Phyllis [2007] SGHC 207, [2008] 2 SLR 239

PP v Rozman bin Jusoh [1995] SGCA 64, [1995] 3 SLR 317

Tan Boon Hock v PP [1994] 2 SLR(R) 32 Wong Keng Leong Rayney v Law Society of
Singapore [2007] SGCA 42, [2007] 4 SLR 377

USA

Hampton v United States, 425 US 484 (1976)

Jacobson v United States, 503 US 540 (1992)

Mathews v United States, 485 US 58 (1988)

Sherman v United States, 356 US 369 (1958)

Sorrells v United States, 287 US 435 (1932)

United States v Russell, 411 US 423 (1973)

Statutes, Conventions, and Statutory Instruments:

Australia

Crimes Act 1914

Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act 1995 (SA)

Evidence Act 1995 (Commonwealth)

Law Enforcement (Controlled Operations) Act 1997 (NSW)

Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 (Qld)

England and Wales

Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984

Europe

European Convention of Human Rights 1950

Federal Republic of Germany

Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland [Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany] 1949

Strafprozeßordnung (StPO) (Code of Criminal Procedure) 2019

Malaysia

Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorism Financing Act 2001

Dangerous Drugs Act 1952

Evidence Act 1950

New Zealand

Evidence Act 2006

Republic of South Africa

Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977

Criminal Procedure Second Amendment Act 85 of 1996

Secondary Sources

- American Law Institute, *Model Penal Code: Official Draft and Explanatory Notes: Complete Text of Model Penal Code as Adopted at the 1962 Annual Meeting of the American Law Institute at Washington, DC, May 24, 1962* (The Institute 1985)
- Ashworth A, 'What is Wrong with Entrapment?' (1999) *Singapore Journal of Legal Studies* 293
- 'Re-drawing the Boundaries of Entrapment' (2002) *Criminal Law Review* 161
- Choo AL-T, *Abuse of Process and Judicial Stays of Criminal Proceedings* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2008)
- Coffey G, 'Entrapment in the Criminal Law: Reassessing the Contours of the Procedural Defence' (2019) 29 *Irish Criminal Law Journal* 68
- Colvin E, 'Controlled Operations, Controlled Activities and Entrapment' (2002) 14 *Bond Law Review* 227
- DeFeo MA, 'Entrapment as a Defense to Criminal Responsibility: Its History, Theory and Application' (1966) 1 *University of San Francisco Law Review* 243
- Dworkin G, 'The Serpent Beguiled me and I Did Eat: Entrapment and the Creation of Crime' (1985) 4 *Law and Philosophy* 17
- Görlitz F, and others, "'Tatprovokation"—The Legal Issue of Entrapment in Germany and Possible Solutions' (2019) 20 *German Law Journal* 496
- Hill DJ, McLeod SK, and Tanyi A, 'The Concept of Entrapment' (2018) 12 *Criminal Law and Philosophy* 539
- 'Entrapment, Temptation and Virtue Testing' (2022) 179 *Philosophical Studies* 2429
- 'What is the Incoherence Objection to Legal Entrapment?' (2022) 22 *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy* 47
- Ho HL, 'State Entrapment' (2011) 31 *Legal Studies* 71

- Hughes PM, 'What is Wrong with Entrapment?' (2004) 42 *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 45
- 'Temptation and Culpability in the Law of Duress and Entrapment' (2006) 51 *Criminal Law Quarterly* 342
- Körner HH, 'Die Tatprovokation in Betäubungsmittelsachen' (2002) 56 *Kriminalistik* 449
- Leverick F, and Stark F, 'How do You Solve a Problem Like Entrapment? *Jones and Doyle v HM Advocate*' (2010) 14 *Edinburgh Law Review* 467
- Marcus P, *The Entrapment Defense* (5th edn, LexisNexis 2016)
- Marx GT, 'Who Really Gets Stung? Issues Raised by the New Police Undercover Work' (1982) 28 *Crime & Delinquency* 165
- Ostendorf H, and Meyer-Seitz C, 'Die strafrechtlichen Grenzen des polizeilichen Lockspitzel-Einsatzes' (1985) *Strafverteidiger* 73
- Schmitt-Leonardy C, 'Entrapment & Evidence—The Impact of the ECtHR's Judgment in the Case of *Furcht v Germany* on the Jurisprudence of the German Federal Court of Justice' (2017) 7 *European Criminal Law Review* 304
- Spencer JR, 'Entrapment and the European Convention of Human Rights' (2001) 60 *Cambridge Law Journal* 30
- Spencer K, and Veale-Martin Ó, 'Fashioning an Irish Entrapment Doctrine' (2005) 15 *Irish Criminal Law Journal* 2
- Squires D, 'The Problem with Entrapment' (2006) 26 *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 351
- Stitt BG, and James GG, 'Entrapment and the Entrapment Defense: Dilemmas for a Democratic Society' (1984) 3 *Law and Philosophy* 111
- Wells C, *Abuse of Process* (3rd edn, Oxford University Press 2017)

Acknowledgements

For their comments or advice, we warmly thank Janneke de Snaijer, Anthony Dillof, Antony Duff, Miroslav Imbrišević, Charlotte Schmitt-Leonardy and Findlay Stark. We remain responsible for any errors.